FY20: Sustaina	ble Materials Management A	Anaerobi	c Digest	ion Fund	ing Opp	ortunity	
	Supporting Anaerobic Diges	stion in Co	mmuniti	ies RFA			
	~Scoring						
Grants gov Tracking Number:	Instructions: Please fill out all of the 188189062	information in th	ne cells provide	ed.			
Applicant Name:	Solana Center for Environmental Innovation						
Project Title:	Regional Excellence in Anaerobic Digester Input						
State:	California R9						Exemption
Region: Reviewer's First and Last Name:	K9						6: Persona
Reviewer's Organization and Region:							Privacy
	Total Ranking Score (100 P	oint Maximum)	Pre-Panel Score	Panel Score Changes	Final Score	Exemption Deliberation	5:
	Evaluation	Criteria					
directly and explicitly address these criteri points under the "Project Sun Criterion 1: Project Summary and Approach Under this criterion, the Agency will evaluat		). Failure to follo ication will be ra	w the required ted under a po	template in App ints system, wit	pendix A may r	esult in a reduction of up to 5	
C (EPA Strategic Plan Linkage),	aticipated Outcomes and Outputs) (45 Boints)						
-	nticipated Outcomes and Outputs). (15 Points)	Pre-Panel	Pre-Panel	Score Change	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason	
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Descriptor	Score	(+/-)		for Score Change	
			•	•	14		Exemption 5: Deliberative Process
h. The extent and quality to which the parra	tive proposal sets forth a clear and reasonable time s	chedule and acc	ociated project	t tacks for achie	ving the projec	t goals and objectives by	
project end. (10 points)	ave proposarsets forth a clear and reasonable time s				ving the project		
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	
					10		
Did the applicant use the Template for Nar	rative Pronosal?	Yes	0	1			
	formance Measurement: Anticipated Outcomes and		points total)				
Under this criterion, applications will be eva results. The proposal will be evaluated base	luated based on the extent to which the "Narrative P d on the extent and quality to which the application:	roposal" realisti					
Measuring Environmental Results: Anticipat	easure success in meeting the project's objectives. C ed Outcomes and Outputs. Outcomes and outputs m ment. Include quantitative targets as appropriate. (1	ust be quantitat O points)		ive and must me		mental improvement or should	
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	
					10		Exemption 5
b. Describes the plan for achieving project re	esults (including the outcomes and outputs identified						Process
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	
			•		5		

Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Pre-Panel Descriptor  Pre-Panel Score Change  Final Score  Final Score  For Score Change  Exemption 5:  Deliberative  Process   Criterion 3: Programmatic Capability and Past Performance (0-15 points)  Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated based on their ability to successfully complete and manage the proposed project, taking into account:  a. Past performance in successfully completing and managing projects, including but not limited to federal and non-federal assistance agreements described in Section 4 of this	c. Describes how the project is transferable	to other communities (5 points)						1
Strengths (Potions is Programmatic Capability and real Preferenance (i) is paid to the control of the control o	c. Describes now the project is transferable	to other communities. (5 points)	Pre-Panel	Pre-Panel	Score Change	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason	
Obliberative Process  Citation is Programmatic Capability and Post Performance (9-15 points)  Linder this criterion, applicants will be evaluated based on the publish to successfully complete and manager the proposed project, taking into account:  Jan Part performance consecusity completing and managing projects, including but not limited to before and non-orderal assistance agreements described in Section 4 of this announcement. (a points)  Strengths (Personn for ownerding points)  Weaknesses (Resonn for and ownerding points)  Fire Fauel  Per Fauel  Fire Fauel  Fore Fauel  Fire Fauel  Fore Fauel  Fire Fauel  Fire Fauel  Fire Fauel  Fore Fauel  Fire Fauel  Fore Fauel  F	Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Descriptor	Score	(+/-)	rillai score	for Score Change	
Deliberative Process  Citation is Pregrammatic Capability and Post Preformance (0.15 points)  Under this culterion, applicants will be evaluated based on the ability to successfully complete and manage the proposed project, taking into account.  **Per Parel**  **Pre-Parel**								
Criterion S. Programmatic Capability and Parl Performance (IN-S points)  Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated based on their ability to successfully complete and manage the proposed project, taking into account:  a. Past performance in successfully completing and managing projects, including but not limited to before a under the project of the amountment. It prints  Strengths (Recorns for ownerling points)  Weaknesses (Recorns for not anounting points)  C. Organizational experience and plan for timely and successfully achieving the operation of the projects successfully achieving the project of the project successfully achieving the operation of the project successfully achieving the operation of the project successfully project and successfully achieve the position of the project successfully achieve the position of the project successfully achieve the position of the project successfully achieves the position of the project successfully achieve the position of the project successfully achieve the position of the project successfully achieve the position of the project successfully achieves the project successfully achie								
Criterion II Pregrammatic Capability and Past Preference ID-15 points)  Under the Interiors, applicants will be evaluated isseed on their ability to society of the Interiors of Int								
Criterion II Pregrammatic Capability and Past Preference ID-15 points)  Under the Interiors, applicants will be evaluated isseed on their ability to society of the Interiors of Int								
Under this criterion, applicants will be replaced about on their shifty to successfully complete and manage the proposed groyest, taking into account:  A star performers is successfully completing and managing projects, including but not limited to federal and non-federal austitance agreements described in Section 6 of this amountement. Is points)  Strengths (fieszons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (fieszons for not owarding points)  Weakness						5		
Under this criterion, applicants will be replaced about on their shifty to successfully complete and manage the proposed groyest, taking into account:  A star performers is successfully completing and managing projects, including but not limited to federal and non-federal austitance agreements described in Section 6 of this amountement. Is points)  Strengths (fieszons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (fieszons for not owarding points)  Weakness								
Under this criterion, applicants will be replaced about on their shifty to successfully complete and manage the proposed groyest, taking into account:  A star performers is successfully completing and managing projects, including but not limited to federal and non-federal austitance agreements described in Section 6 of this amountement. Is points)  Strengths (fieszons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (fieszons for not owarding points)  Weakness								
Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated based on their shifty to successfully complete and manage the proposed project, laking into account:  A star performers is successfully completing and managing projects, including but not limited to federal and non-federal austitance agreements described in Section 6 of this amountement. Is points)  Strengths (feasons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (feasons for not awarding points								
Stengths (Resons for awarding points)  1. History of meeting the reporting requirements under the assistance agreements described in Section 4 of this amountement. Identify whether your organization submitted acceptable final technical reports under those agreements and the extent to which the applicant adequately and timely reported on their progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes under those agreements and if such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately and timely reported on their progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes under those agreements and if such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately and timely reported on their progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes under those agreements and if such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately and timely reported on their progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes under those agreements and if such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately and timely reported on their progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes under those agreements and if such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately and timely reported on their progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes under those agreements and if such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately and timely reported on their progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes under those agreements and if such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately and timely reported on their progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes under those agreements and if such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately and timely reported on their progress towards achieving the expected on their progress towards achieving the control of their progress. The progress towards and the extent and the extent and under the progress of the progress of their progres								
a. Past performance in successfully completing and managing projects, including but not limited to federal and non-federal assistance agreements described in Section 4 of this announcement. (I points)  Strengths (Resons for owarding points)  Weaknesses (Resons for not owarding points)  Weak	Criterion 3: Programmatic Capability and Pa	ast Performance (0-15 points)						
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not			nd manage the	proposed proj	ect, taking into a	ccount:		
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not	a. Past performance in successfully completi	ing and managing projects, including but not limited t	o federal and n	on-federal assi	stance agreeme	nts described i	n Section 4 of this	
Strengths (fleasons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (fleasons for not awarding points)  Listory of meeting the reporting requirements under the assistance agreements described in Section A of this announcement. Identify whether your organization submitted acceptable final technical reports under those agreements and the extent to which the applicant adequately and timely reported on their progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes under those agreements and its such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately and timely reported on their progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes under those agreements and its such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately and timely reported on their progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes under those agreements and its such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately and timely reported on their progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes under those agreements and its such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately and timely reported on their progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes under those agreements and its such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately and timely reported on their progress towards achieving the objectives of the proposed project. This soul include staff expertise/qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources or the ability to obtain them, to successfully achieve the goals of the proposed project. To soul include staff expertise/qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources or the ability to obtain them, to successfully achieve the goals of the proposed project. To soul include staff expertise/qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources or the ability to obtain them, to successfully achieve the goals of the proposed project. To soul include staff expertise/qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources or the ability to obtain them, to successfully achieve the goal	announcement. (5 points)		Dro Danel	Dro Danol	Score Change		Doct Dissussion Notes: Peason	
b. History of meeting the reporting requirements under the assistance agreements described in Section 4 of this announcement. Identify whether your organization submitted acceptable of the process of the property of the pr	Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)				Final Score		
b. History of meeting the reporting requirements under the assistance agreements described in Section 4 of this announcement. Identify whether your organization submitted acceptable of the process of the property of the pr								1
b. History of meeting the reporting requirements under the assistance agreements described in Section 4 of this announcement. Identify whether your organization submitted acceptable of the process of the property of the pr						4		
b. History of meeting the reporting requirements under the assistance agreements described in Section 4 of this announcement. Identify whether your organization submitted acceptable final technical reports under those agreements and its between the spellicant adequately panel described in Section 4 of this announcement. Identify whether your organization submitted acceptable final store from the property of the						•		Exemption 5:
in a technical reports under those agreements and the extent to which the applicant adequately exported on their propers towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes under those agreements and if such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately reported why not. [5 points]  Strengths (Reasons for owarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Weak			<u> </u>	<u> </u>				
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Pre-Panel Score Change Final Score Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  Pre-Panel Score Change Final Score Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change Pre-Panel Score Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change Pre-Panel Score Chan								Process
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not						s achieving the	expected outputs and	
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Pre-Panel Descriptor  Pre-Panel Descriptor  Score Change  (+/-)  Final Score  Final Score  Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  Exemption 5:  Deliberative Process  Deliberative Process  Exemption 5:  Deliberative Process			_			Final Score		
c. Organizational experience and plan for timely and successfully achieving the objectives of the proposed project. This could include staff expertise/qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources or the ability to obtain them, to successfully achieve the goals of the proposed project. (5 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Pre-Panel Descriptor  Score (4/-)  Final Score  Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  Score Change  Pre-Panel Descriptor  Score Change  Final Score  Final Score  Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  Exemption 5:  Deliberative Process  Descriptor  Score Change  Final Score  Exemption 5:  Deliberative Process  Exemption 5:  Deliberative Pr	Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Descriptor	Score	(+/-)	Tillul Score	for Score Change	
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Note: Reason for Score Change  Descriptor  Pre-Panel Descriptor  Pre-Panel Score (+/-)  Final Score  Final Score  Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  Final Score  Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  Score Change  Exemption 5:  Deliberative Process  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Pre-Panel Descriptor  Pre-Panel Descriptor  Pre-Panel Score Change  Final Score Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change						5		
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Note: Reason for Score Change  Descriptor  Pre-Panel Descriptor  Pre-Panel Score (+/-)  Final Score  Final Score  Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  Final Score  Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  Score Change  Exemption 5:  Deliberative Process  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Pre-Panel Descriptor  Pre-Panel Descriptor  Pre-Panel Score Change  Final Score Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	c Organizational experience and plan for tin	only and successfully achieving the objectives of the p	ronoced projec	t This could in	clude staff evne	rtice/aualificat	ions staff knowledge and	
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Descriptor  Pre-Panel Descriptor  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Pre-Panel Descriptor  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Pre-Panel Score Change  Exemption 5: Deliberative Process  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Pre-Panel Descriptor				t. This could in	ciuue staii expe	rtise/quaiiiicat	ions, stan knowledge, and	
Criterion 4: Project Sustainability (0: 15 points)  Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which:  a. The applicant can demonstrate its ability to promote and continue efforts to support AD after EPA funding for this project has ended, as described in Section 1 of the RFA.  (5 points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Descriptor  Pre-Panel Pre-Panel Score Change  Exemption 5: Deliberative Process  5  Deliberative Process  The application describes the extent to which the project supports a state or local mandate, policy, or community priority to remove food waste and organic materials from the municipal waste streams. (10 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Pre-Panel Pre-Panel Score Change  Pre-Panel Score Change  Final Score Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  Pre-Panel Descriptor  Pre-Panel Score Change  Final Score Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	Character (Commercial)	W-1				Final Score		
Criterion 4: Project Sustainability (12 (1) min (12 min)	Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Descriptor	Score	(+/-)		for Score Change	
Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which:  a. The applicant can demonstrate its ability to promote and continue efforts to support AD after EPA funding for this project has ended, as described in Section 1 of the RFA.  (5 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Descriptor  Pre-Panel Descriptor  Score Change  Exemption 5: Deliberative Process  Descriptor  Descriptor  Descriptor  Descriptor  Descriptor  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Pre-Panel Descriptor  Pre-Pan						3		
Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which:  a. The applicant can demonstrate its ability to promote and continue efforts to support AD after EPA funding for this project has ended, as described in Section 1 of the RFA.  (5 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Descriptor  Final Score  Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  Exemption 5:  Deliberative Process  Descriptor  Descriptor  Descriptor  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Pre-Panel Descriptor  Pre-Panel Descriptor  Pre-Panel Descriptor  Pre-Panel Descriptor  Final Score  Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  Final Score  Final Score  Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	Criterion 4: Project Sustainability (0:15 poin	rts total)						
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Pre-Panel Descriptor  Score Change  Final Score Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  Exemption 5:  Deliberative Process  Final Score Change  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Pre-Panel Descriptor  Pre-Panel Score Change  Final Score Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change								
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Note: Reason for Score Change  Exemption 5:  Deliberative Process  To be application describes the extent to which the project supports a state or local mandate, policy, or community priority to remove food waste and organic materials from the municipal waste streams. (10 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Pre-Panel Descriptor  Pre-Panel Pre-Panel Score Change  Final Score Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	a. The applicant can demonstrate its ability t	to promote and continue efforts to support AD after F	EPA funding for	this project ha	s ended, as desc	ribed in Sectio	n 1 of the RFA.	
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Descriptor  Score  (+/-)  Final Score  For Score Change  Exemption 5: Deliberative Process   Descriptor Score Change  Final Score  Final Sc								
b. The application describes the extent to which the project supports a state or local mandate, policy, or community priority to remove food waste and organic materials from the municipal waste streams. (10 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Pre-Panel Score Change  Pre-Panel Score Change  Final Score Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	Strengths (Regions for gwarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)				Final Score		
b. The application describes the extent to which the project supports a state or local mandate, policy, or community priority to remove food waste and organic materials from the municipal waste streams. (10 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Pre-Panel Descriptor  Score (+/-)  Final Score Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	occupants (neusons for awarding points)	Treaminesses (measons for not awarding points)	осветрен	Store	(+7-)		ioi score change	
b. The application describes the extent to which the project supports a state or local mandate, policy, or community priority to remove food waste and organic materials from the municipal waste streams. (10 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Pre-Panel Score Change  Final Score Final Score Final Score for Score Change								
b. The application describes the extent to which the project supports a state or local mandate, policy, or community priority to remove food waste and organic materials from the municipal waste streams. (10 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Pre-Panel Score Change (+/-)  Score (+/-)  Final Score Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change								
b. The application describes the extent to which the project supports a state or local mandate, policy, or community priority to remove food waste and organic materials from the municipal waste streams. (10 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Pre-Panel Descriptor  Score (+/-)  Final Score Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change								
waste streams. (10 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Pre-Panel Descriptor  Pre-Panel Score Change (+/-)  Final Score Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change						5		7 700233
waste streams. (10 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Pre-Panel Descriptor  Pre-Panel Score Change (+/-)  Final Score Final Score Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change				_				
waste streams. (10 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Pre-Panel Descriptor  Pre-Panel Score Change (+/-)  Final Score Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change								
waste streams. (10 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Pre-Panel Descriptor  Pre-Panel Score Change (+/-)  Final Score Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change								
waste streams. (10 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Pre-Panel Descriptor  Pre-Panel Score Change (+/-)  Final Score Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change								
waste streams. (10 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Pre-Panel Descriptor  Pre-Panel Score Change (+/-)  Final Score (+/-)  For Score Change	h The application describes the output to un	high the project supports a state or local mandata.	licy or comm	nity priority to	remove food	ste and organi	ic materials from the municipal	
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  Descriptor  Score (+/-)  Final Score for Score Change		men the project supports a state of local manuale, po	cy, or commun	y priority to	. Callove Toola Wa	ote una organi	e materials from the municipal	
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points) Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points) Descriptor Score (+/-) for Score Change	Strangths / Pag for any	Weekperses /Perses-ft				Final Score		
	Strengths (neasons for awarding points)	weaknesses (neasons for not awarding points)	Descriptor	score	(+/-)		for score Change	
				_	_			
					•	9		

Criterion 5: Effective Partnerships (0-10 po	ints total)						
Under this criterion, the Agency will evaluat	e the application based on how well the applicant ad	dresses the follo	owing:				
- B				-1-1-11		h	
expanded, describe the additional members	on currently in place to support the proposed project	and wny it is su	mcient to com	piete the propos	sea project. If t	ne partnersnip will be	
	project and their experience working with the target	audience and/o	r sectors addre	essed. Applicant	s that do not p	lan on collaborating with other	
	ated based on the extent to which they demonstrate						
collaboration. (10 points)							
		Pre-Panel	Pre-Panel	Score Change	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason	
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Descriptor	Score	(+/-)	Timur ocore	for Score Change	
							Exemption 5:
							Deliberative
							Process
					10		
			-				
Criterion 6: Budget and Expenditure of Awa	l arded Grant Funds (0-10 points total)						
	e the proposed project budget and narrative to deter	mine the exten	t and quality to	which:			
a. Costs are reasonable to accomplish the p	roposed goals, objectives, and measurable environme	ental outcomes.	(3 points)				
		Pre-Panel	Pre-Panel	Score Change	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason	
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Descriptor	Score	(+/-)	Tillal Score	for Score Change	
					2		
			•		_		
b. The proposed budget provides a detailed	breakout of the approximate funding used for each n						
		Pre-Panel	Pre-Panel	Score Change	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason	
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Descriptor	Score	(+/-)		for Score Change	Exemption 5:
							Deliberative
		l	l _				Process
					2		
c. The applicant conveys their approach, pro	ocedures, and controls for ensuring that awarded grain				ent manner. (		
Strongth (Barrens for averding a sintel	Washington (Barrens for ant automotion animal)	Pre-Panel	Pre-Panel	Score Change	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason	
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Descriptor	Score	(+/-)		for Score Change	
			l _				
					3		
							Exemption 5:
							Deliberative
							Process
Criterion 7: Voluntary Leveraging (0.5 point	is total)						
Under this criterion, applicants will be evalu	ated based on the extent they demonstrate:						
	funding with other federal and/or non-federal sources	s of funds/resou	rces to leverag	ge additional res	ources beyond	the grant funds awarded to	
carry out the proposed project(s)							
and/or b. That FPA funding will complement activit	ies relevant to the proposed project(s) carried out by	the applicant w	ith other source	es of funds or re	esources Appli	cants will also be evaluated	
	g proposed, how the applicant will obtain the leverage						
	the role the leveraged resources will play to support						
		Pre-Panel	Pre-Panel	Score Change	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason	
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Descriptor	Score	(+/-)	rillai score	for Score Change	

		ı		4		Exemption 5: Deliberative Process
General Comments  If you would like to include any general comments on the applicant's response to the evaluation	n criteria please p	ut them here.	These comment	s will not impa	ct scoring.	

FY20: Sustaina	ble Materials Management A	Anaerobi	c Digest	ion Fund	ing Opp	ortunity	
	Supporting Anaerobic Diges		mmunit	ies RFA			
	~Scoring	Sheet~					
Crante gov Teacking Number	Instructions: Please fill out all of the 188189062	information in t	ne cells provid	ed.			-
Grants gov Tracking Number: Applicant Name:							1
Project Title:	Regional Excellence in Anaerobic Digester Input						Exemp
State:	California						6: Pers
Region: Reviewer's First and Last Name:	R9						Privac
Reviewer's Organization and Region:							1
	Total Ranking Score (100 P	oint Maximum)	Pre-Panel Score	Panel Score Changes	Final Score	Exemption 5: Delib Process	berative
	Evaluation	Criteria					1
Eliaible entities whose applications meet	the threshold criteria in Section 3 of this announceme	ent will be reviev	ved according	to the evaluation	n criterion set i	forth below. Applicants must	
directly and explicitly address these criteri	a in the Template for Narrative Proposal (Appendix A	). Failure to follo	w the required	d template in Ap	pendix A may r	result in a reduction of up to 5	
	nmary and Approach" evaluation criterion. Each appl	ication will be ra	ted under a po	oints system, wit	h a total of 10	0 points possible.	
terion 1: Project Summary and Approacl der this criterion, the Agency will evaluat							
der tills criterion, the Agency will evaluat	c.						1
	tive proposal includes a well-conceived strategy for a	addressing the re	quirements in				
ction 1, Parts B (Scope of Work), EPA Strategic Plan Linkage),							
	nticipated Outcomes and Outputs). (15 Points)						
		Pre-Panel	Pre-Panel	Score Change	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason	ו
rengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Descriptor	Score	(+/-)		for Score Change	Exempt
							Delibera
							Process
					14	ı	
The extent and quality to which the narra	itive proposal sets forth a clear and reasonable time s	schedule and ass	ociated projec	t tasks for achie	ving the projec	ct goals and objectives by	
oject end. (10 points)				I		I	
trengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	ו
in chights (nearons) for a variating points,	weatherses (neasons for not a naturing points)	Descriptor	50010	(-11		ior ocore change	1
		<u></u>	_				
					8	3	Exempt
the applicant use the Template for Nar	· ·	Yes	0				Deliber
terion 2: Environmental Results and Per	formance Measurement: Anticipated Outcomes and	Outputs (0-20)	oints total)				Process
nder this criterion, applications will be eva	luated based on the extent to which the "Narrative P	Proposal" realisti	cally describes	how the projec	t will lead to m	neasurable environmental	
sults. The proposal will be evaluated base	d on the extent and quality to which the application:						
Clearly describes how the applicant will m	neasure success in meeting the project's objectives. C	learly specify an	ticipated envir	ronmental outco	mes and outp	uts as described in Section 1.D,	
easuring Environmental Results: Anticipat	ed Outcomes and Outputs. Outcomes and outputs m	ust be quantitat	ive or qualitat	ive and must me	asure environ	mental improvement or should	
directly linked to environmental improve	ement. Include quantitative targets as appropriate. (1	<del>,</del>				In	4
trengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	יי
arengans (neusons joi awarang points)	Weaking points)	Descriptor	30016	(77)		ior score change	1
		<u></u>					
					8	B	4
Describes the plan for achieving project r	esults (including the outcomes and outputs identified I	in Section 1). (9	points) Pre-Panel	Score Change		Post-Discussion Notes: Reason	-
trengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Descriptor	Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	for Score Change	1
o (	, or not area and points,		21012			e shange	Exempt
							Deliber
							Process

Pre-Panel Descriptor Pre-Panel Score Score Change (+/-)

Final Score

Post-Discussion Notes: Reasor for Score Change

c. Describes how the project is transferable to other communities. (5 points)

Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)

Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)

							Exemption 5
		<u> </u>	_	l _			Deliberative
	10 ( (045 ) )				5		Process
Criterion 3: Programmatic Capability and P	ast Performance (0-15 points) ated based on their ability to successfully complete a	nd manage the	proposed proje	act taking into a	ccount:		ł
							1
	ing and managing projects, including but not limited	to federal and no	on-federal assi	stance agreeme	nts described i	in Section 4 of this	
announcement. (5 points)		Pre-Panel	Pre-Panel	Score Change		Post-Discussion Notes: Reason	ł
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Descriptor	Score	(+/-)	Final Score	for Score Change	1
, , , , <u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>	, , ,			.,,			1
		L	_	_			
					4		
	nents under the assistance agreements described in S						
	nts and the extent to which the applicant adequately			_	s achieving the	e expected outputs and	
outcomes under those agreements and if su	ch progress was not being made whether the applica	Pre-Panel	Pre-Panel	Score Change		Post-Discussion Notes: Reason	1
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Descriptor	Score	(+/-)	Final Score	for Score Change	1
	. , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	-					Exemption
							Deliberativ
							Process
					4		1
c. Organizational experience and plan for tir	nely and successfully achieving the objectives of the	proposed projec	t. This could in	clude staff expe	rtise/qualificat	tions, staff knowledge, and	
resources or the ability to obtain them, to s	uccessfully achieve the goals of the proposed project						
Character (Dances for according a sinte)	Marken (Barrens for an annual	Pre-Panel	Pre-Panel	Score Change	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason	
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Descriptor	Score	(+/-)		for Score Change	1
					2	2	
	and the first IV						1
							1
	ated based on the extent and quality to which:						]
Under this criterion, applicants will be evalu	ated based on the extent and quality to which:	EPA funding for	this project ha	s ended, as desc	ribed in Section	on 1 of the RFA.	
Under this criterion, applicants will be evalu		EPA funding for	this project ha	s ended, as desc	ribed in Sectio	on 1 of the RFA.	
Under this criterion, applicants will be evalu a. The applicant can demonstrate its ability (5 points)	ated based on the extent and quality to which: to promote and continue efforts to support AD after	Pre-Panel	Pre-Panel	Score Change		Post-Discussion Notes: Reason	
Under this criterion, applicants will be evalu The applicant can demonstrate its ability	ated based on the extent and quality to which:				ribed in Section		
Under this criterion, applicants will be evalure.  The applicant can demonstrate its ability of points.	ated based on the extent and quality to which: to promote and continue efforts to support AD after	Pre-Panel	Pre-Panel	Score Change		Post-Discussion Notes: Reason	
Under this criterion, applicants will be evalure.  The applicant can demonstrate its ability of points.	ated based on the extent and quality to which: to promote and continue efforts to support AD after	Pre-Panel	Pre-Panel	Score Change		Post-Discussion Notes: Reason	
Under this criterion, applicants will be evalure.  The applicant can demonstrate its ability of points.	ated based on the extent and quality to which: to promote and continue efforts to support AD after	Pre-Panel	Pre-Panel	Score Change		Post-Discussion Notes: Reason	
Under this criterion, applicants will be evalu a. The applicant can demonstrate its ability (5 points)	ated based on the extent and quality to which: to promote and continue efforts to support AD after	Pre-Panel	Pre-Panel	Score Change		Post-Discussion Notes: Reason	
Under this criterion, applicants will be evalu a. The applicant can demonstrate its ability (5 points)	ated based on the extent and quality to which: to promote and continue efforts to support AD after	Pre-Panel	Pre-Panel	Score Change		Post-Discussion Notes: Reason	
Under this criterion, applicants will be evalu a. The applicant can demonstrate its ability (5 points)	ated based on the extent and quality to which: to promote and continue efforts to support AD after	Pre-Panel	Pre-Panel	Score Change		Post-Discussion Notes: Reason	
Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluant.  The applicant can demonstrate its ability (5 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	ated based on the extent and quality to which: to promote and continue efforts to support AD after	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	
Under this criterion, applicants will be evalua. The applicant can demonstrate its ability (5 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  b. The application describes the extent to w	ated based on the extent and quality to which: to promote and continue efforts to support AD after  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	
Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated as a the applicant can demonstrate its ability (5 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  b. The application describes the extent to waste streams. (10 points)	ated based on the extent and quality to which:  to promote and continue efforts to support AD after  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  hich the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports and the project supports a state or local mandate, project supports and the project supports a state or local mandate, project supports and the project supports and the project supports a state or local mandate, proje	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-) remove food wa	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  ic materials from the municipal	Exemption :
Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated as a The applicant can demonstrate its ability (5 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  b. The application describes the extent to we	ated based on the extent and quality to which: to promote and continue efforts to support AD after  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	Deliberative
Under this criterion, applicants will be evalual.  The applicant can demonstrate its ability (5 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  b. The application describes the extent to waste streams. (10 points)	ated based on the extent and quality to which:  to promote and continue efforts to support AD after  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  hich the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports and the project supports a state or local mandate, project supports and the project supports a state or local mandate, project supports and the project supports and the project supports a state or local mandate, proje	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-) remove food wa	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  ic materials from the municipal	-xempulen
Under this criterion, applicants will be evalua. The applicant can demonstrate its ability (5 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  b. The application describes the extent to waste streams. (10 points)	ated based on the extent and quality to which:  to promote and continue efforts to support AD after  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  hich the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports and the project supports a state or local mandate, project supports and the project supports a state or local mandate, project supports and the project supports and the project supports a state or local mandate, proje	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-) remove food wa	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  ic materials from the municipal	Deliberative
Under this criterion, applicants will be evalual.  The applicant can demonstrate its ability (5 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  b. The application describes the extent to waste streams. (10 points)	ated based on the extent and quality to which:  to promote and continue efforts to support AD after  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  hich the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports and the project supports a state or local mandate, project supports and the project supports a state or local mandate, project supports and the project supports and the project supports a state or local mandate, proje	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-) remove food wa	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  ic materials from the municipal	Deliberative
Under this criterion, applicants will be evalua. The applicant can demonstrate its ability (5 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  b. The application describes the extent to wwaste streams. (10 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	ated based on the extent and quality to which:  to promote and continue efforts to support AD after  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  hich the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports and the project supports a state or local mandate, project supports and the project supports a state or local mandate, project supports and the project supports and the project supports a state or local mandate, proje	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-) remove food wa	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  ic materials from the municipal  Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	Deliberative
Under this criterion, applicants will be evalua. The applicant can demonstrate its ability (5 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  b. The application describes the extent to waste streams. (10 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	ated based on the extent and quality to which:  to promote and continue efforts to support AD after  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  hich the project supports a state or local mandate, provided the project supports and the project supports are project supports and the project supports are project supports and the project supports are project supports and the project supports are project supports and the project supports and the project supports are project supports and the project supports and the project supports are project	Pre-Panel Descriptor  Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-) remove food wa	Final Score  5 siste and organ  Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  ic materials from the municipal  Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	Deliberative
Under this criterion, applicants will be evalua. The applicant can demonstrate its ability (5 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  b. The application describes the extent to waste streams. (10 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	ated based on the extent and quality to which:  to promote and continue efforts to support AD after  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  hich the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports a state or local mandate, property and the project supports and the project supports a state or local mandate, project supports and the project supports a state or local mandate, project supports and the project supports and the project supports a state or local mandate, proje	Pre-Panel Descriptor  Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-) remove food wa	Final Score  5 siste and organ  Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  ic materials from the municipal  Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	Deliberative
Under this criterion, applicants will be evalua. The applicant can demonstrate its ability (5 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  b. The application describes the extent to waste streams. (10 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Criterion 5: Effective Partnerships (0.40 points)  Under this criterion, the Agency will evaluate	ated based on the extent and quality to which:  to promote and continue efforts to support AD after  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  hich the project supports a state or local mandate, provided the project supports and the project supports are project supports and the project supports are project supports and the project supports are project supports and the project supports are project supports and the project supports and the project supports are project supports and the project supports and the project supports are project	Pre-Panel Descriptor  olicy, or commun	Pre-Panel Score  nity priority to  Pre-Panel Score	score Change (+/-)  remove food was Score Change (+/-)	Final Score  5 siste and organ  Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  ic materials from the municipal  Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	Deliberative
Under this criterion, applicants will be evalua. The applicant can demonstrate its ability (5 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  b. The application describes the extent to waste streams. (10 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Criterion 5: Effective Partnerships (0.40 points)  Under this criterion, the Agency will evaluate	weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  thich the project supports a state or local mandate, points (Reasons for not awarding points)  weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  the application based on how well the applicant adoptour currently in place to support the proposed project	Pre-Panel Descriptor  olicy, or commun	Pre-Panel Score  nity priority to  Pre-Panel Score	score Change (+/-)  remove food was Score Change (+/-)	Final Score  5 siste and organ  Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  ic materials from the municipal  Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	Deliberative
Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated a. The applicant can demonstrate its ability (5 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  b. The application describes the extent to waste streams. (10 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Criterion 5: Effective Partnerships (0.10 points)  Under this criterion, the Agency will evaluate a. Describes the partnerships and/or coalitie expanded, describe the additional members b. Describes the role of each partner on the	weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  according to the application based on how well the applicant adon currently in place to support the proposed project at that will be engaged and/or recruited.	Pre-Panel Descriptor  Descriptor  Descriptor  Pre-Panel Descriptor  Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score  nity priority to  Pre-Panel Score  fficient to com	score Change (+/-)  remove food wa  Score Change (+/-)	Final Score  Seed project. If 1 s that do not p	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  ic materials from the municipal  Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  the partnership will be	Deliberative
Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated a. The applicant can demonstrate its ability (5 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  b. The application describes the extent to waste streams. (10 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Criterion 5: Effective Partnerships (0.300 points)  Under this criterion, the Agency will evaluated a. Describes the partnerships and/or coalities expanded, describe the additional members b. Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated.	weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  and the application based on how well the applicant adon currently in place to support the proposed projects that will be engaged and/or recruited.	Pre-Panel Descriptor  Descriptor  Descriptor  Pre-Panel Descriptor  Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score  nity priority to  Pre-Panel Score  fficient to com	score Change (+/-)  remove food wa  Score Change (+/-)	Final Score  Seed project. If 1 s that do not p	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  ic materials from the municipal  Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  the partnership will be	Deliberative
Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated as The applicant can demonstrate its ability (5 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  b. The application describes the extent to waste streams. (10 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Criterion 5: Effective Partnerships (0.300 points)  Under this criterion, the Agency will evaluate as Describes the partnerships and/or coalities expanded, describe the additional members to Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated.	weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  according to the application based on how well the applicant adon currently in place to support the proposed project at that will be engaged and/or recruited.	Pre-Panel Descriptor  Descriptor  Dicy, or community of the community of t	Pre-Panel Score  hity priority to Pre-Panel Score  wing:  fficient to com or sectors addrie able to effect	score Change (+/-)  remove food was Score Change (+/-)  plete the proposessed. Applicant	Final Score  Seed project. If 1 s that do not p	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  ic materials from the municipal Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  the partnership will be plan on collaborating with other ne project without such	Deliberative
Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated as The applicant can demonstrate its ability (5 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  b. The application describes the extent to waste streams. (10 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Criterion 5: Effective Partnerships (0.300 points)  Under this criterion, the Agency will evaluate as Describes the partnerships and/or coalities expanded, describe the additional members to Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated.	weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  according to the application based on how well the applicant adon currently in place to support the proposed project at that will be engaged and/or recruited.	Pre-Panel Descriptor  Descriptor  Descriptor  Pre-Panel Descriptor  Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score  nity priority to  Pre-Panel Score  fficient to com	Score Change (+/-)  remove food was Score Change (+/-)  plete the proposessed. Applicant tively perform and	Final Score  Seed project. If 1 s that do not p	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  ic materials from the municipal  Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  the partnership will be	Deliberative
Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated as The applicant can demonstrate its ability (5 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  b. The application describes the extent to waste streams. (10 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Criterion 5: Effective Partnerships (0.30 points)  Under this criterion, the Agency will evaluate as Describes the partnerships and/or coalities to Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the r	weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  thich the project supports a state or local mandate, power points (Reasons for not awarding points)  weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  the the application based on how well the applicant adaption currently in place to support the proposed project that will be engaged and/or recruited.  project and their experience working with the target atted based on the extent to which they demonstrate	Pre-Panel Descriptor  olicy, or community Pre-Panel Descriptor  dresses the following and why it is sufficient and why will be the pre-Panel Pre-Panel	Pre-Panel Score  Pre-Panel Score  Pre-Panel Score  Owing:  Or sectors addre able to effect	score Change (+/-)  remove food was Score Change (+/-)  plete the proposessed. Applicant	Final Score  Seed project. If it is that do not paid complete the	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  ic materials from the municipal  Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  the partnership will be olan on collaborating with other project without such	Deliberative
Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated as The applicant can demonstrate its ability (5 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Do The application describes the extent to waste streams. (10 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Criterion 5: Effective Partnerships (0.30 points)  Under this criterion, the Agency will evaluate as Describes the partnerships and/or coalities to Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the r	weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  thich the project supports a state or local mandate, power points (Reasons for not awarding points)  weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  the the application based on how well the applicant adaption currently in place to support the proposed project that will be engaged and/or recruited.  project and their experience working with the target atted based on the extent to which they demonstrate	Pre-Panel Descriptor  olicy, or community Pre-Panel Descriptor  dresses the following and why it is sufficient and why will be the pre-Panel Pre-Panel	Pre-Panel Score  Pre-Panel Score  Pre-Panel Score  Owing:  Or sectors addre able to effect	Score Change (+/-)  remove food was Score Change (+/-)  plete the proposessed. Applicant tively perform and	Final Score  Seed project. If it is that do not paid complete the	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  ic materials from the municipal  Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  the partnership will be olan on collaborating with other project without such	Deliberative Process
Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated as The applicant can demonstrate its ability (5 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  b. The application describes the extent to waste streams. (10 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Criterion 5: Effective Partnerships (0.30 points)  Under this criterion, the Agency will evaluate as Describes the partnerships and/or coalities to Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the r	weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  thich the project supports a state or local mandate, power points (Reasons for not awarding points)  weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  the the application based on how well the applicant adaption currently in place to support the proposed project that will be engaged and/or recruited.  project and their experience working with the target atted based on the extent to which they demonstrate	Pre-Panel Descriptor  olicy, or community Pre-Panel Descriptor  dresses the following and why it is sufficient and why will be the pre-Panel Pre-Panel	Pre-Panel Score  Pre-Panel Score  Pre-Panel Score  Owing:  Or sectors addre able to effect	Score Change (+/-)  remove food was Score Change (+/-)  plete the proposessed. Applicant tively perform and	Final Score  Seed project. If it is that do not paid complete the	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  ic materials from the municipal  Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  the partnership will be olan on collaborating with other project without such	Deliberative Process
Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated as The applicant can demonstrate its ability (5 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  b. The application describes the extent to waste streams. (10 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Criterion 5: Effective Partnerships (0.30 points)  Under this criterion, the Agency will evaluate as Describes the partnerships and/or coalities to Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the r	weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  thich the project supports a state or local mandate, power points (Reasons for not awarding points)  weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  the the application based on how well the applicant adapted to support the proposed project that will be engaged and/or recruited.  project and their experience working with the target atted based on the extent to which they demonstrate	Pre-Panel Descriptor  olicy, or community Pre-Panel Descriptor  dresses the following and why it is sufficient and why will be the pre-Panel Pre-Panel	Pre-Panel Score  Pre-Panel Score  Pre-Panel Score  Owing:  Or sectors addre able to effect	Score Change (+/-)  remove food was Score Change (+/-)  plete the proposessed. Applicant tively perform and	Final Score  Seed project. If it is that do not paid complete the Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  ic materials from the municipal  Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  the partnership will be plan on collaborating with other project without such  Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	Deliberative Process Exemption 5 Deliberative
Under this criterion, applicants will be evalual. The applicant can demonstrate its ability (5 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  b. The application describes the extent to waste streams. (10 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Criterion 5: Effective Partnerships (0.30 points)  Under this criterion, the Agency will evaluate a Describes the partnerships and/or coalities b. Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated and the partnerships (10 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  The transport of the application based on how well the applicant adaption currently in place to support the proposed project that will be engaged and/or recruited.  Project and their experience working with the target atted based on the extent to which they demonstrate  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor  olicy, or community Pre-Panel Descriptor  dresses the following and why it is sufficient and why will be the pre-Panel Pre-Panel	Pre-Panel Score  Pre-Panel Score  Pre-Panel Score  Owing:  Or sectors addre able to effect	Score Change (+/-)  remove food was Score Change (+/-)  plete the proposessed. Applicant tively perform and	Final Score  Seed project. If it is that do not paid complete the	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  ic materials from the municipal  Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  the partnership will be plan on collaborating with other project without such  Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	Deliberative Process
Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated as a The applicant can demonstrate its ability (5 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  b. The application describes the extent to waste streams. (10 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Criterion 5: Effective Partnerships (0.50 points)  Under this criterion, the Agency will evaluate a Describes the partnerships and/or coalitie expanded, describe the additional members to Describe the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project perform	weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  The transport of the application based on how well the applicant adaption currently in place to support the proposed project that will be engaged and/or recruited.  Project and their experience working with the target atted based on the extent to which they demonstrate  Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor  Descriptor  Pre-Panel Descriptor  dresses the folloand why it is suffactor  audience and/ohow they will be Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score  nity priority to  Pre-Panel Score  owing:  fficient to com or sectors addrie able to effect  Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)  remove food was Score Change (+/-)  plete the proposessed. Applicant tively perform an Score Change (+/-)	Final Score  Seed project. If it is that do not paid complete the Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  ic materials from the municipal  Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  the partnership will be plan on collaborating with other project without such  Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	Deliberative Process Exemption 5 Deliberative
Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated a. The applicant can demonstrate its ability (5 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  b. The application describes the extent to waste streams. (10 points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)  Criterion 5: Effective Partnerships (0.10 points)  Under this criterion, the Agency will evaluated a. Describes the partnerships and/or coalitie expanded, describe the additional members b. Describes the role of each partner on the groups in project performance will be evaluated as a point of the points of the poin	weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)  The project supports a state or local mandate, power of the points	Pre-Panel Descriptor  Descriptor  Descriptor  Pre-Panel Descriptor  Descriptor  Descriptor  Descriptor  Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score  nity priority to  Pre-Panel Score  owing:  fficient to com or sectors addre able to effect  Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)  remove food was Score Change (+/-)  plete the proposessed. Applicant tively perform an Score Change (+/-)	Final Score  Seed project. If it is that do not paid complete the Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  ic materials from the municipal  Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change  the partnership will be plan on collaborating with other project without such  Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	Deliberative Process Exemption 5 Deliberative

							1
							Exemption 5
					2		Deliberative
b. The proposed budget provides a detailed	breakout of the approximate funding used for each n	najor activity. (4	4 points)				Process
		Pre-Panel	Pre-Panel	Score Change	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason	
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Descriptor	Score	(+/-)	Tillal Score	for Score Change	
c. The applicant conveys their approach, pro	I ocedures, and controls for ensuring that awarded gran	nt funds will be	expended in a	timely and effici	ent manner. (3	3 points)	
		Pre-Panel	Pre-Panel	Score Change		l i	1
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Descriptor	Score	(+/-)	Final Score	w	
				_			
Criterion 7: Voluntary Leveraging (0.5 point	tstotall						
	nated based on the extent they demonstrate:						
a. How they will coordinate the use of EPA f	unding with other federal and/or non-federal sources	of funds/resou	rces to leverag	e additional res	ources beyond	the grant funds awarded to	
carry out the proposed project(s)							
and/or							
<ul> <li>b. That EPA funding will complement activit</li> </ul>	ies relevant to the proposed project(s) carried out by	the applicant w	ith other source	es of funds or re	sources. Appli	cants will also be evaluated	
	g proposed, how the applicant will obtain the leverage				materialize du	ring grant performance, the	
strength of the leveraging commitment, and	the role the leveraged resources will play to support						
		Pre-Panel	Pre-Panel	Score Change	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason	Exemption 5:
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Descriptor	Score	(+/-)		for Score Change	Deliberative
							Process
							Frocess
			_				
							l
General Comments							1
If you would like to include any general com	ments on the applicant's response to the evaluation	criteria please p	ut them here.	These comment	s will not impa	ct scoring.	

## FY20: Sustainable Materials Management Anaerobic Digestion Funding Opportunity Supporting Anaerobic Digestion in Communities RFA "Scoring Sheet" Instructions: Please fill out all of the information in the cells provided. Grants gov Tracking Number: 188189062 Applicant Name: Solana Center for Environmental Innovation Project Title: Regional Excellence in Anaerobic Digester Input State: California Region: R9 Reviewer's First and Last Name: Reviewer's Organization and Region:

Total Ranking Score (100 Point Maximum)

Pre-Panel Score Changes

Final Score

Exemption 5: Deliberative Process

Exemption

6: Personal

Privacy

## **Evaluation Criteria**

Eligible entities whose applications meet the threshold criteria in Section 3 of this announcement will be reviewed according to the evaluation criterion set forth below. Applicants must directly and explicitly address these criteria in the Template for Narrative Proposal (Appendix A). Failure to follow the required template in Appendix A may result in a reduction of up to 5 points under the "Project Summary and Approach" evaluation criterion. Each application will be rated under a points system, with a total of 100 points possible.

Criterion 1: Project Summary and Approach

Under this criterion, the Agency will evaluate:

 a. The extent and quality to which the narrative proposal includes a well-conceived strategy for addressing the requirements in Section 1, Parts B (Scope of Work),

C (EPA Strategic Plan Linkage),

and D (Measuring Environmental Results: Anticipated Outcomes and Outputs). (15 Points)

	Character (Dances for sounding a sint)	Weekenson / Demonstrate Associated	Pre-Panel	Pre-Panel	Score Change	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason	
ŀ	Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Descriptor	Score	(+/-)		for Score Change	
١								
ŀ								ĺ
								ĺ
								Ех
								De
								Pr
								ĺ
								1
ı								
ı								
ı								
ı						13		

b. The extent and quality to which the narrative proposal sets forth a clear and reasonable time schedule and associated project tasks for achieving the project goals and objectives by project end. (10 points)

project end. (10 points)							
		Pre-Panel	Pre-Panel	Score Change	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reaso	n
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Descriptor	Score	(+/-)	Final Score	for Score Change	
							1
							ı
							E
							L
							F
							I
							Л
			_	_			Ш
					10		
_							
Did the applicant use the Template for Nar	rative Proposal?	Yes	0				

Criterion 2: Environmental Results and Performance Measurement: Anticipated Outcomes and Outputs

Under this criterion, applications will be evaluated based on the extent to which the "Narrative Proposal" realistically describes how the project will lead to measurable environmental results. The proposal will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which the application:

a. Clearly describes how the applicant will measure success in meeting the project's objectives. Clearly specify anticipated environmental outcomes and outputs as described in Section 1.D, Measuring Environmental Results: Anticipated Outcomes and Outputs. Outcomes and outputs must be quantitative or qualitative and must measure environmental improvement or should be directly linked to environmental improvement. Include quantitative targets as appropriate. (10 points)

Exemption 5: Deliberative Process

Exemption 5: Deliberative Process

		Pre-Panel	Pre-Panel	Score Change		Post-Discussion Notes: Reason	l
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Descriptor	Score	(+/-)	Final Score	for Score Change	
							Exemption 5:
							Deliberative
							Process
					10		
b. Describes the plan for achieving project re	esults (including the outcomes and outputs identified	in Section 1). (5	Pre-Panel	Score Change		Post-Discussion Notes: Reason	
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Descriptor	Score	(+/-)	Final Score	for Score Change	
							Exemption 5:
							Deliberative Process
					5		1 100033
c. Describes how the project is transferable	to other communities. (5 points)	Pre-Panel	Pre-Panel	Score Change	5. 10	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason	
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Descriptor	Score	(+/-)	Final Score	for Score Change	
Criterion 3: Programmatic Capability and Pa	act Performance (0-15 points)				5		
	ated based on their ability to successfully complete a	nd manage the	proposed proje	ect, taking into a	ccount:		
a. Past performance in successfully completi	ing and managing projects, including but not limited t	to federal and n	on-federal assi	stance agreeme	nts described i	n Section 4 of this	
announcement. (5 points)		Pre-Panel	Pre-Panel	Score Change		Post-Discussion Notes: Reason	
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Descriptor	Score	(+/-)	Final Score	for Score Change	
							Exemption 5:
							Deliberative
			_		_		Process
h History of my 11				ld	5	<u> </u>	
	nents under the assistance agreements described in S nts and the extent to which the applicant adequately						
	ch progress was not being made whether the applica	nt adequately re	eported why n	ot. (5 points)			
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	
					5		
c. Organizational experience and plan for tin	nely and successfully achieving the objectives of the p	proposed project	t. This could in	clude staff expe	rtise/qualificat	ions, staff knowledge, and	
	accessfully achieve the goals of the proposed project.	(5 points)			and qualificat		
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	
		Descriptor	30010	(1)		.o. score change	ı

							1
							Exemption 5:
							Deliberative
							Process
Criterion 4: Project Sustainability (0-15 poil	nts total)						
Under this criterion, applicants will be evalu	ated based on the extent and quality to which:						
	to promote and continue efforts to support AD after I	EPA funding for	this project ha	s ended, as desc	ribed in Sectio	n 1 of the RFA.	
(5 points)		Des Deseil	Des Desel	C Ch		D-+ Dii N-+ D	
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	
Strengths (neusons for awarding points)	weaknesses (neasons for not awarding points)	Descriptor	30016	(+/-)		101 Score Change	
		I					
					5		
b. The application describes the extent to w	hich the project supports a state or local mandate, po	olicy, or commun	nity priority to	remove food wa	aste and organi	c materials from the municipal	
waste streams. (10 points)							
		Pre-Panel	Pre-Panel	Score Change	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason	
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Descriptor	Score	(+/-)		for Score Change	
					10		Exemption 5:
Criterion 5: Effective Partnerships (0.10 poi	instolal)	draceae tha falla	wina:				Deliberative
onder this criterion, the Agency will evaluat	e the application based on how well the applicant add	uresses the folio	owing.				Process
a. Describes the partnerships and/or coalition	on currently in place to support the proposed project	and why it is suf	fficient to com	plete the propos	sed project. If t	he partnership will be	
expanded, describe the additional members							
b. Describes the role of each partner on the	project and their experience working with the target	audience and/o	r sectors addr	essed. Applicant	s that do not p	lan on collaborating with other	
groups in project performance will be evaluate	ated based on the extent to which they demonstrate	how they will be	e able to effect	tively perform a	nd complete th	e project without such	
collaboration. (10 points)							
0. 1. (0. (. );		Pre-Panel	Pre-Panel	Score Change	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason	
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Descriptor	Score	(+/-)		for Score Change	
Criterion 6: Budget and Expenditure of Awa	arded Grant Funds (0.40 points total)						
	e the proposed project budget and narrative to deter	mine the extent	and quality to	which:			
	roposed goals, objectives, and measurable environme						
	, , , ,	Pre-Panel	Pre-Panel	Score Change		Post-Discussion Notes: Reason	
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Descriptor	Score	(+/-)	Final Score	for Score Change	
		1	1				
			l _				
			1	<u></u>	3		
<ul> <li>ne proposed budget provides a detailed</li> </ul>	breakout of the approximate funding used for each n			Coors Character		Post Dissussion Notes: De-	
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Pre-Panel Descriptor	Pre-Panel Score	Score Change (+/-)	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason for Score Change	
strengths (neasons for awarding points)	weaknesses (neasons for not awarding points)	Descriptor	Score	(+/-)		ior score change	Exemption 5:
			I ∎		3		Deliberative
c. The applicant conveys their approach, pro	ocedures, and controls for ensuring that awarded gran	nt funds will be	expended in a	timely and effici	ent manner. (3	points)	Process
		Pre-Panel	Pre-Panel	Score Change	l .	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason	
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Descriptor	Score	(+/-)	Final Score	for Score Change	
		I					
		I					
		I					
			•		2		
Criterion 7: Voluntary Leveraging (0.5 point	is total)			-			
	ated based on the extent they demonstrate:						
,	,						

a. How they will coordinate the use of EPA funding with other federal and/or non-federal sources of funds/resources to leverage additional resources beyond the grant funds awarded to									
carry out the proposed project(s)									
and/or									
b. That EPA funding will complement activities relevant to the proposed project(s) carried out by the applicant with other sources of funds or resources. Applicants will also be evaluated									
based on the type and amount of leveraging	proposed, how the applicant will obtain the leverage	ed resources, the	e likelihood th	e leveraging will	materialize du	ring grant performance, the			
strength of the leveraging commitment, and	I the role the leveraged resources will play to support	the proposed p	roject activitie	es. (5 points)					
		Pre-Panel	Pre-Panel	Score Change	Final Score	Post-Discussion Notes: Reason			
Strengths (Reasons for awarding points)	Weaknesses (Reasons for not awarding points)	Descriptor	Score	(+/-)	rillai Score	for Score Change			
							Exemption 5:		
							Deliberative		
							Process		
					4				
	<del></del>		-				_		

## **General Comments**

If you would like to include any general comments on the applicant's response to the evaluation criteria please put them here. These comments will not impact scoring.